

weapons, at the same time implying that we can be more sure that weapons exist in the absence of inspections?

Is it not true that the U.N.'s International Atomic Agency was able to complete its yearly verification mission to Iraq just this year with Iraqi cooperation?

Is it not true that the intelligence community has been unable to develop a case tying Iraq to global terrorism at all, much less the attacks on the United States last year? Does anybody remember that 15 of the 19 hijackers came from Saudi Arabia and that none came from Iraq?

Was former CIA counterterrorism chief Vincent Cannistraro wrong when he recently said there was no confirmed evidence of Iraq's links to terrorism?

Is it not true that the CIA has concluded there is no evidence that a Prague meeting between 9-11 hijacker Atta and Iraqi intelligence took place?

Is it not true that northern Iraq, where the administration claimed that al Qaeda was hiding out, was in control of our allies, the Kurds?

Is it not true that the vast majority of the al Qaeda leaders who escaped appear to have safely made their way to Pakistan, another of our so-called allies?

Has anyone noticed that Afghanistan is rapidly sinking into total chaos, with bombings and assassinations becoming daily occurrences; and that is according to a recent U.N. report, the al Qaeda "is, by all accounts, 'alive and well' and poised to strike again, how, when and where it chooses"?

Why are we taking precious military resources away from tracking down those who did attack the United States, who may again attack the United States, and using them to invade countries that have not attacked the United States?

Would an attack on Iraq not just confirm the Arabs' worst suspicions about the United States, and is this not just what Osama bin Laden wanted to have happen?

How can Hussein be compared to Hitler when he has no navy or air force, and now has an army one-fifth the size it was 12 years ago, which even then proved itself totally inept in defending itself?

Is it not true that the constitutional power to declare war is exclusively given to Congress? Should presidents, contrary to the Constitution, allow Congress to concur only when pressured by public opinion? Are presidents permitted to rely on U.N. permission to go to war?

Are you aware of a Pentagon report studying charges that thousands of Kurds in one village were gassed by Iraqis, which found no conclusive evidence that Iraq was responsible, that Iran occupied the very city involved, and that evidence indicated, according to this Pentagon report, the type of gas used was more likely controlled by Iran, not Iraq?

Is it not true that between 100,000 to 300,000 soldiers have suffered from Persian Gulf War syndrome from the first Gulf War, and that thousands may have died?

Are we prepared for possibly thousands of American casualties in a war against a country that does not have the capacity to attack the United States?

Are we willing to bear the economic burden of a \$100 billion war against Iraq, with oil prices expected to skyrocket and further rattle an already shaky American economy? How about an estimated 30 years occupation of Iraq that some have deemed necessary to build democracy there?

Iraq's alleged violations of U.N. resolutions are given as reason to initiate an attack, yet is it not true that hundreds of U.N. resolutions have been ignored by various countries without penalty?

Did former President Bush not cite the U.N. resolution of 1990 as the reason he could not march into Baghdad, while supporters of a new attack assert that is the very reason that we can march into Baghdad?

Is it not true that, contrary to current claims, the no-fly zones were set up by Britain and the United States without specific approval by the United Nations?

If we claim membership in the international community and conform to its rules only when it pleases us, does this not serve to undermine our position, directing animosity toward us by both friend and foe?

How can our declared goal of bringing democracy to Iraq be believable when we prop up dictators throughout the Middle East and support military dictators like Musharraf in Pakistan who overthrew a democratically elected President?

Are you familiar with the 1994 Senate Hearings that revealed the United States knowingly supplied chemical and biological materials to Iraq during the Iran-Iraq war and as late as 1992—including after the alleged Iraqi gas attack on a Kurdish village?

Did we not assist Saddam Hussein's rise to power by supporting and encouraging his invasion of Iran? Is it honest to criticize Saddam now for his invasion of Iran, which as the time we actively supported?

Is it not true that preventive war is synonymous with an act of aggression, and has never been considered a moral or legitimate U.S. policy?

Why do the oil company executives strongly support this war if oil is not the real reason we plan to take over Iraq?

Why is it that those who never wore a uniform and are confident that they won't have to personally fight this war are more anxious for this war than our generals?

What is the moral argument for attacking a nation that has not aggressed against us nor is able to, even if it so wished?

Where does the Constitution grant us permission to wage war for any reason other than self-defense?

It is not true that a war against Iraq rejects the sentiments of the time-honored Treaty of Westphalia, nearly 400 years ago, that countries should never go into another for the purpose of regime change?

Is it not true that the more civilized a society is, the less likely disagreements will be settled by war?

Is it not true that since World War II Congress has not declared war and—not coincidentally—we have not since then had a clear-cut victory?

Is it not true that Pakistan, especially through its intelligence services, was an active supporter and key organizer of the Taliban?

Why do those who want war not bring a Declaration of War Resolution to the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO LINK BETWEEN SADDAM HUSSEIN AND AL QAEDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today's press reveals that the Bush administration has decided that they can find no linkage between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda, despite some of the offhand remarks of Secretary Rumsfeld and Vice President CHENEY to the contrary. The intelligence agencies, turning all of their resources to this, cannot find existing links.

So that means that the President and his administration will have to make the case against Saddam Hussein to this Congress because the authorization passed by this Congress last fall was for the President to respond to those who were involved in the attacks and those who harbored or sponsored such attacks. That means a straight-up debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, hopefully a free and fair debate, over the wisdom of the first-